Redacted Pursuant to Protective Order at Request of Defendants

\$ \$Figueira Decl. Tab \$ 70

To: "Kelsey LeBeau" <kelsey@youtube.com> From: "Yi-Ling Su" <yilingsu@google.com> Cc: "Chris Maxcy" <maxcy@google.com>, "Christopher LaRosa" <clarosa@google.com>, "David G King" <dgking@google.com> Bcc: Received Date: 2008-02-29 10:37:12 GMT Re: UMG to enable 100% Audio Claims Subject: On Fri, Feb 29, 2008 at 2:19 PM, Kelsey LeBeau <kelsey@youtube.com> wrote: > Yi-ling -> Happy friday! A few quick items: > 1) UMG wants to move forward with audio fingerprinting all of their > content. potentially a big impact. They seemed to be most upset about > videos with lots of unmonetized embedded views, but once we have the > fingerprint, we can't restrict the videos we claims to low views, etc. We > could see if the VideoID implementation eases some of their concerns (but it > is doubtful). Here are some options: a) Block all videos that we don't have publishing b) Offer UMG the ad-inventory for the videos that we don't have

> Actually it would be easier if we could switch it to track where we don't

> publishing (we would have to run this by compliance) as a way to keep them

have 100% publishing, Just because that Is the current biz logic that we do with their other tracks.

> Please let me know what we would need. Would UMG need to send us the > tracks in the same format that we have been receiving w/limited > publishers? Would we be able to use the CSV file that I sent to you as a

> weekly update?

> live on YT (Block embeds)
> c) Other ideas?

Is it because it's a different group sending us the file that it can't be the same format that we are already receiving from them?

2) I proposed that make their cleared audio available for audio swap and > audio fingerprinting. Would we be able to pull audio files from the

> teleporter the way we pull the metadata? (we really need a better "Remixer"

> option!)

This would be a new feature but I imagine that would be possible.

> 3) Do we have any updates on the Prince tracks and discrepancies that AM

> did not have data for. In a call with the claiming team at UMG earlier

> today, they mentioned that there are many examples of 'Reference Files" that

> do not have any matching, but there are videos that have the tracks. (I am

DATE: 12.12.08 DEPONENT: KING

EXHIBIT#

CASE: Viacom, et al., v. YouTube, et al., The Football Association Premier League, et al., v. YouTube, et al., Case Nos. 07-CV-2203 and 07-CV-3582 A. Ignacio Howard, CLR, RPR, CSR No. 9830

GOO001-01998280

70-0002 > still digging out of email, so if I missed this update, sorry!) Sorry, the last update was from Lou saying he was checking on something. I just sent him an email back asking about status. yi-ling > Thanks, > Kelsey > Kelsey LeBeau > YouTube, Strategic Partner Manager > 901 Cherry Avenue > San Bruno, CA 94066 > Fax (650) 887-2536 > This email may be confidential or privileged. If you received this > communication by mistake, please don't forward it to anyone else, please > erase all copies and attachments, and please let me know that it went to the > wrong person. Thanks.

G00001-01998281